DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 939 FL 006 101

AUTHOR Crystal, David
TITLE The Educational Use of Linguistics.
PUB DATE Jan 73
NOTE 9p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Applied Linguistics; Curriculum Development; English Education; *Language Instruction; *Language Programs; Linguistic Competence; *Linguistic Theory; Second Language Learning; *Teacher Education; Teaching Techniques

ABSTRACT

Linguistics can contribute to language education by making teachers empirically aware of the complexity of language, methodologically attuned to improved teaching techniques, and theoretically informed about the general nature of language. Past education projects which have been affected by the application of linguistic principles are Breakthrough to Literacy, which involved the recognition of linguistic competence, and Literary Stylistics, which employed linguistics for understanding literary effects. The potential contribution of linguistics to language education is high. However, there are difficulties of implementation which must be overcome. The primary difficulty in the use of linguistics is the amount of formalism the subject contains, prohibiting its application to classroom teaching. Thus, what teachers need is not linguistics, but functional "language awareness" as employed in the Language in Use Project. However, "language awareness" must be based on "linguistic awareness," which involves establishing training criteria for teachers that will close the gap between formalism and functionalism. (LG)

ED 091937

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

1. THE EDUCATIONAL USE OF LINGUISTICS

Dr David Crystal - University of Reading

Over the past 5 years, largely thanks to the interest of the DES Inspectorate in English, I have been able to give many lectures to groups of teachers, from nursery level to the sixth-form, variously entitled 'Linguistics and the teacher', 'Language and the teacher', and the like. 'The teacher' here is usually the teacher of English, less often of modern languages, rarely of science or religious education, and never, regrettably, of PT. (The link between language development and the realising of body movement potential - what I suppose would be called 'eurhythmy'[1] is a much neglected scientific field of study!)

The lectures 'Language and the teacher' and 'Linguistics and the teacher' are of course by no means the same. The second presupposes the first. A talk on 'language' aims to convince the teacher of the importance of language as a means of communication and a medium of education; to demonstrate something of the range of language variation and function in a community, of the power and resources and limitations of language, and of the complexity of language as an acquired structure. A talk on linguistics takes most of this for granted, and suggests how our knowledge of 'how language works' can be broadened and deepened by the use of facts, techniques, and principles derived from linguistics. The aim is primarily to bring our knowledge of language's structure and function out into the open: to provide a principled and explicit awareness of the phenomenon, one which is capable of formulation and definition in precise terms, so that it can be used as a means of facilitating communication between people of similar preoccupations, and also as a means of developing a consistency and coherence in our views and studies of language. A brief example of these aims would be stylistics, where it is generally accepted that the provision of a linguistic basis can in principle provide an 'objective correlative' for our critical opinions, a means of improving our chances of reaching a widely comprehensible and comprehensive apparatus for the analysis of texts. (What is disputed is which particular descriptive apparatus is the most illuminating, and whether linguistic stylistics can be expected to produce semantic insights.)

Five years ago, then, most of my talks were on language: these days they are talks on linguistics. From the point of view of the linguist, at any rate, much progress has been made. Language sensitisation, as a teacher-training policy, seems now to have become a fact, and a fashionable one. Thanks to in-service courses, a wide range of introductory books on language in education, and a couple of ear-catching controversial theories (first Chomsky's, and then Bernstein/Labov's), language sensitivity has become the norm. What still remains is the larger task, to develop awareness scientific: 'to instil', as BAAL put it, 'a sense of rational enquiry in relation to language'.[2]

The motivation which makes teachers begin looking at introductory textbooks on linguistics, sociolinguistics, etc, seems to come from 2 sources, one negative, one positive. The negative motivation is usually dissatisfaction with available techniques: a realization that traditional descriptions, theories, and methods of analysis are inadequate as a means of coping with problems of language enrichment. This is so familiar a point as not to require illustration. The positive motivation comes from the recognition of a particular linguistic insight, which prompts a sympathetic

---

[1] Cf R Steiner, EURHYTHMY AS VISIBLE SPEECH (New York & London: Anthroposophic Press, 1956).

[2] Submission to the Committee of Inquiry into Reading and the Use of English, January 1973, p.3.

FL 00 6 101

consideration of the subject as a whole. In this respect, the contributions of linguistics can be summarised under 3 general headings: empirical, methodological, and theoretical.

pronunciation and grammar, and in dictionaries, and related to historical, social and psychological variables (the latter covering such data as information about acceptability, attitudes to usage, and so on). I find that on the whole teachers underestimate the complexity of language structure and function, and are

could cite the phenomenon of intonation as a broad area whose structural complexity and function is largely unfamiliar to most teachers, and whose relevance (eg in the assessment of reading skills) is largely ignored; in syntax there is the vast array of previously unreported facts that provide much of the impact of the GRAMMAR OF CONTEMPORARY ENGLISH[1]; in vocabulary, there are the structural studies of semantic relationships, which are slowly influencing current practices in lexicography. In general, one might say that there is a resilient amongst teachers to accept traditional stereotypes of linguistic behaviour, and that one contribution of linguistics is to penetrate these stereotypes to demonstrate the reality of language use.[2]

But of course, there is the old point that in a sense there are no such things as pure linguistic 'facts': facts change depending on the way we observe them, and the importance of psychological self-awareness becomes manifest. Here too there are traditional stereotypes of analysis and description, and the contribution of linguistics has been to draw attention to the limitations of our traditional techniques and to provide alternatives. For instance, all introductory textbooks of course point the weaknesses of the parts of speech model of analysis for grammar, for instance, and indicate alternatives: and there is the traditional confusion between concepts that should be kept apart (such as time and tense, gender and sex, etc - a theme well emphasised by Palmer, 1965[3]). The issue, of course, is more fundamental than the descriptive arguments involved. The important point, in the first instance, is not, for example, whether English has a future tense or not, but that there is a question here which ought to be asked. The dangers of methodological complacency, the distortions of outdated models, the restrictiveness of rigid parsing techniques, and so on, are matters which the linguist can readily point out through examples of this kind, as he can the desiderata implicit in a linguistic approach - the need for a precise terminology, a powerful notation, a well-developed model, a systematic procedure. In particular, the linguist's concern for methodological awareness emerges most clearly in his awareness of the possibility of alternative analyses, and the need to specify criteria in order to justify particular solutions - for instance, in developing a system of word-classification. I shall return to this point below.

By a theoretical contribution, I am referring, in the first instance, to the reasoning which has led to the establishment of general explanatory principles about the nature of language - fundamental principles which seem to underlie all linguistic theories and models. Some such principles would be: the distinction between form and meaning, description and prescription, langue and parole, and paradigmatic and syntagmatic; the notions of language system, language variety, and linguistic level; the inevitability of language change, and the universal stages of language acquisition. Each of these principles is important, not only in itself, but also because it has direct implications for any pragmatic or pedagogical views about language, eg explaining attitudes to correctness, or analysing problems of comprehension. Within each of these headings, more specific principles can be

---

[1] See R Quirk, et al, Longman, 1972.

[2] This notion of stereotype and reality is explored in relation to conversation in D Crystal, 'The nature of advanced conversation: stereotype and reality in linguistics and language teaching', in GAL Proceedings, 1972.

[3] F R Palmer, GRAMMAR. (Penguin, 1965).

formulated depending on our choice of linguistic model, eg the postulate of a particular set of levels, or the generative conception of deep vs. surface structure, or the notion of elaborated vs. restricted codes. The process could continue indefinitely. But the present paper, all I wish to argue is that the most valuable contribution linguistics can make at the theoretical level is to develop a general 'state of mind' about language based upon these maximally general assumptions, the aim being to remove misconceptions about language which distort it, and which in the various applied spheres could be harmful to progress.

to someone, or that there is no system in English spelling, or that a child brought up in a bilingual environment will be language-delayed. Once again, the linguistic contribution is not necessarily to provide an answer: it is to make people aware that there is an issue. In the example just given, the discussion might take the following form. The conventional reasoning in favour of a language-delay hypothesis is common-sensical in origin: a child exposed to more than one language will be like a computer short: there will be widespread interference; and linguistic development will be both slower and poorer, accordingly. Against this, it is possible to put forward various arguments: that it is impossible to generalise without a clarification of what is meant by 'bilingualism', cases where the child is exposed to the 2 languages in equal proportions being extremely rare; that the 2 languages come to be associated with distinct social roles, so that as long as the social setting remains clear, the languages remain unconfused; that we should not underestimate the child's linguistic abilities - particularly when we note the 'multidialectism' present in all of us, and the fact that the majority of the world's children are reared in a multilingual environment; and lastly the speculation that if there is any kind of innate linguistic ability, the availability of more than one language for it to 'practise on' might produce children whose language developed more rapidly than the reverse. All of this is hypothetical, in the absence of much detailed study, but the existence of an Issue is indisputable, and once it has been pointed out and discussed, a deeper understanding of the problem is generally recognised.

Examples of specific principles originating in linguistics which have influenced or directed applied projects are not hard to find. Two must suffice. First there is the basic principle seen in BREAKTHROUGH TO LITERACY that the linguistic complexity of reading materials should be firmly based upon the spoken competence of the child, at whatever level. The principle may seem self-evident, but it is well-known that it was flouted widely and seriously in the past. A syntactic analysis of the sentence patterns in the first books of, say, JANET AND JOHN or the LADYBIRD series, shows that there is little consistency, and that many of the patterns used are either very much ahead of a 5-year old, or simply not English at all. Sentence length varying from 1 to 14 words; frequency of relatively uncommon usages, such as the present tense; sentences such as 'What have you, John?' and 'One little, two little, three little kittens'[1]; and so on. The linguistic idea behind the sentence-maker is that

---

[1] Of course, with appropriate intonation, this last example could be made acceptable: but it is rarely presented to the child in such a way (eg in a sing-song, rhythmic way), and in reading back I have never heard anything other than the usual flat one-word/one-tone-unit production on the part of the children. I cite this in order to bring out the point that the whole question of the relationship between intonation and punctuation, between pauses and the lay-out of the material on the page, and the significance attached to prosodic features (albeit unconsciously) by teachers in evaluating success in reading (aloud) needs to be investigated. (The only attempt I have seen to introduce ideas about intonation into a discussion of [illegible] is in J Dixon and R G Gregory, [illegible] WRITING (Nelson, 1968)).

this point which has motivated the recent emphasis on language in education by Barnes, Britton, Creber, the Rosens, and others.

A second example of a specific linguistic contribution is in literary stylistics, the use of linguistics in providing a metalanguage for discussion of a text, and a systematic method for analysing it. It is sometimes said that linguistics can provide a basis for the understanding of literary effects. The comment of Dr Johnson (quoted by R Quirk, THE USE OF ENGLISH, 1962: 231) that 'every English poet should master the rules of grammar before he attempts to bend or break them' applies a fortiori to critics and stylisticians, anxious to explicate the author's choices and our responses. Much of the discussion has been of the 'deviant' type, where the potential effects of the 'deviant' structure are explained by reference to the 'norm' structure - in this case, 'a N_{temp} ago' - in non-literary language (cf G N Leech, A LINGUISTIC GUIDE TO ENGLISH POETRY, 1969: 56); and the concepts of norm and deviation have of course been illuminating. But in addition there is the argument 'ex variatione': if literature is mimetic of all aspects of human experience, this argument runs, then this must include our linguistic as well as our non-linguistic experience: ... Joyce ... essentially aims himself drawing on the whole range of language's resources in his work. The perception of any effect due to the juxtaposition of stylistic features belonging to different varieties is obviously dependent upon one's perception of the features as such. There is no irony in the opening page of Joyce's ULYSSES without an awareness of the force and function of the religious phraseology involved. In this sense, literary stylistics is dependent on general stylistics, and while this is not to say anything about how this dependence might be recognised in the construction of courses, it is to say that the factor must be borne in mind throughout the process of construction.

The potential contribution of linguistics is thus extremely wide; and one would perhaps have expected to see more progress being made than in fact has emerged. But the number of major pedagogically-orientated linguistic projects is small, and relatively few materials across the field of mother-tongue teaching have appeared. Why has this been so? The reasons, one supposes, are partly practical, partly principle. For instance, it is a fact that for many years most linguists interested in applying their subject went in the direction of foreign language teaching, and until recently there was little research money available for mother-tongue teaching projects. There has also been considerable duplication of effort - projects in mother-tongue teaching, speech therapy, or speech and drama being begun without an awareness of the literature in foreign-language teaching, for instance. More important, there have been 2 kinds of misunderstanding about the contribution of linguistics. The first is from people who have read nothing about the subject, but who feel on a priori grounds that here is a method which can either be of no value whatsoever (eg 'How can you scientifically analyse literature?') OR be a panacea for all traditional inadequacies (talk of 'the linguistic approach' or the 'structural approach' - again, replicating the history of ideas in English language teaching). The second misunderstanding was on the part of people who had tried to read in the subject without guidance and who tried to apply it prematurely or without due consideration (eg getting sixth-formers to write generative grammars without asking why[1]). There has been a tendency to suppose that by [illegible]

---

[1] The pragmatic point about generative grammar has recently been made by C J Fillmore, 'A GRAMMARIAN LOOKS AT SOCIOLINGUISTICS', in GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY ROUND TABLE ON LINGUISTICS AND LANGUAGE TEACHING', 1972: 276 'There is no way ... of talking about grammaticality or well-formedness without getting in many ways involved in the details of social interaction by means of language', and cf. further, 282, ff.

to teachers - partly because of the time it would take to master the approach, partly because the elaborateness and comprehensiveness implicit in the approach is of no achievement unnecessary for the solution of pedagogical problems in language. The misunderstanding is obvious, and of course had already been anticipated by Chomsky for generative grammar, who denied the pedagogical relevance of his work.

[illegible] to these stereotypes have been slow in forthcoming, and have been mixed - largely reflecting their uncertainty as to whether their discipline ought to develop primarily on theoretical lines, or whether questions of social and personal responsibility ought to dictate a more applied direction for their work (in this respect reflecting current discussion as to the purpose of university education, the changing character of students' interests, and so on). But certain points do need to be emphasised, in any discussion of the relationship between linguistics and [illegible]: for instance, that the subject ought not to be identified with [illegible] any one of its models, and that one has to be extremely selective in applying the subject's findings. It is still necessary to say clearly that some parts of linguistics are more applicable than others, that some models of linguistic behaviour are more immediately and usefully applicable than others, and so on (utility of application here referring to the capability of a linguistic notion to generate fruitful pedagogical hypotheses, eg the notion of language variety as a [illegible] factor in the LANGUAGE IN USE project). It has also to be recognised that the subject has serious self-imposed or historically explicable limitations, and it is important for everyone to be aware of this, linguist as well as teacher. For instance linguistics is strongly biased towards the study of language production and not comprehension (traditionally the province of the psychologist) - thus we find considerable recent discussion on 'oracy' but next to nothing on the equally active process of 'auracy'. As long as these limitations are recognised, there is no problem. The danger comes with the familiar discrepancy between the problems of the classroom and the problems which the linguist is used to dealing with - the danger is that the linguist overreaches himself, applying techniques in places where they should never have been allowed to go, providing pseudo-solutions to pseudo-problems, and possibly using up a great deal of public money in the process. There are 2 dangers which linguists have to walk a tightrope between: 'stating the obvious' and 'being irrelevant'. It may seem trite, but the only way in which this can be done is by being scrupulously self-critical, of oneself as well as one's subject - an attitude which I personally find comes most readily by placing one's subject in the perspective of current thinking in the philosophy of science. For example, much of the bitterness which accompanied the sterotyped opposition between stylistics and literary criticism might have been avoided, one could argue, if the intuitive element which underlies all linguistic stylistic enquiry (eg in the initial selection of texts for study, in the assessment of stylistic significance or similarity) had been recognised - a point which can be made about scientific enquiry as a whole.[1]

I make these points in order to give some recognition to the fact that there are considerable difficulties in implementing the claimed contribution of linguistics to educational studies - difficulties due to the differing aims of the subjects, the differing experience of the investigators, and so on. But these are all difficulties which, as our experience of the situation improves, should disappear. What I want to do now is look at a difficulty which will not disappear, unless we consciously dispense with it, because it is felt to be a question of principle

---

[1] It is made, for instance, by P B Medawar, THE ART OF THE SOLUBLE (Penguin, 1967): the stylistic issue is raised in D Crystal, 'Objective and subjective in stylistics', in B Kachru and H Stahlke (editors), CURRENT TRENDS IN STYLISTICS (Edmonton: Linguistic Research Inc).

between linguistics, as an academic discipline, and language teaching. This is the view that teachers do not need linguistics, but something which is referred to as 'language awareness' (or some similar phrase). The authors of the LANGUAGE IN USE project (LIU), for example, say at one point: 'the teacher ..... is unlikely to find the central concern of the specialist in Linguistics, the explicit, formal and analytical description of the patterns of a language, immediately relevant to his needs' (P Doughty, J Pearce and G Thornton, LANGUAGE IN USE, 1971, p 11). Or again, in the first instance the teacher's job is 'not to impart a body of knowledge, but to work upon, develop, refine and clarify the knowledge and intuitions that his pupils already possess', and to study language functionally, pragmatically, 'the means by which individual human beings relate themselves to the world, to each other, and to the community of which they are members' (p 11). In a more recent publication, the approach is developed into a philosophy of 'Language Study' (P Doughty and G Thornton, LANGUAGE STUDY, THE TEACHER AND THE LEARNER, 1973: 47, ff). What are the implications of these statements? On the face of it, they add up to a radical statement of disassociation. I think it is worth our looking at this point in some detail, as the implications do well beyond the Language in Use project as such, and raise issues equally applicable to any educational project which desires a linguistic orientation. I shall however restrict my illustration to Language in Use in the first instance, as I have worked with the materials of this course at some length, and find that a great deal of value can be learned by looking carefully (and I hope constructively) at its limitations. It should go without saying that I would not be doing this if I did not think this course to be an important contribution to the field of educational linguistics.

To begin with, it is worth pointing out that the view of linguistics found in the above quotations is very much a stereotype: it is a conception of linguistics as a descriptive study, providing a detailed account of a language's structural properties, and so on. But this conception of linguistics is not fair to the subject AS IT IS TAUGHT in universities in this country. The academic subject deals with both the formal study and the social, psychological, and other implications. To treat linguistics as if it were an academic subject somehow separate from language in some social sense is to raise a straw man. Language in Use is as much an exercise in linguistics (of one kind) as phonetics practicals are. The aims are similar, the presuppositions are similar - even some of the techniques are the same (eg some of the substitution exercises). Let us then be clear that we are talking about one kind of linguistics, when we are examining the orientation of Language in Use - at least this way we shall avoid having to talk about teachers 'languaging' pupils, and the like! My point is more or less recognised in Doughty and Thornton, where a distinction is drawn between a 'narrow' and a 'broad' view of Linguistics: the former sees Linguistics 'as a discipline which is concerned exclusively with the organization of the sound patterns of natural languages, and their relationship to the corresponding organization of the internal pattern of those languages, phonological, grammatical and lexical' (49); the broad view sees Linguistics as part of the study of human behaviour - Firth is quoted, the aim being 'to make statements of meaning so that we can see how we use language to live' (51). It is precisely a broad view of Linguistics which I am insisting on. What I fail to see is the distinction between this and 'Language Study', in their sense - though perhaps this is not surprising, as it depends upon a highly abstract and ill-defined notion of 'agency' vs. 'process' (see pp 51-2). But there are more important reasons for my attitude than this essentially terminological point.

The distinction between linguistics and language study is a good example of a pseudo-opposition, for the simple reason that the latter is dependent upon the former in certain crucial respects. Even if we accept the above restricted definition of the subject as a body of descriptive knowledge about structures - the 'narrow' view - it is possible to argue that this CANNOT be left out of the teacher's consideration, and that trying to do so causes more problems than it solves. Language in Use claims that its aim is 'to provide an approach to the study of our own language that neither demands of the teacher specialised knowledge

... linguistic science, nor requires of the pupil mastery of analytical procedures and unfamiliar technical terms' (8). This is defensible, for the pupil; but some familiarity is essential for the teacher, and indeed it is unavoidable. In the interests of consistency, coherence, and comparability, one needs some specialised terms and procedures. Without this information, he will find it impossible to achieve his aims. And much of the frustration felt by many teachers over the new emphasis in language study, I believe, is due to the fact that they fully see the point of the exercise, but having been led a little way along the road they are then left without any transport for getting to their destination, and moreover told that not only is transport not available, but that they should not even be thinking of ... transport! Under such circumstances, no wonder many teachers decide not to travel.

The crux of the matter is that it is of course impossible to do without theoretical or descriptive terms in even the most casual analysis of language; and the argument continues that in that case they might as well be introduced systematically and used precisely. Language in Use itself inevitably uses large numbers of such terms - transition, form, adjective, sentence, grammatical class, active voice .... Many of these terms are familiar, but of course their senses may be very different (eg the Halliday an concept of 'transitivity'). And unless the teacher understands the basis and boundaries of this terminology, how can he carry out even the most elementary exercises involving it with confidence? For instance, a number of the units tell the pupils to go and look for other examples of the same kind of linguistic phenomena as the one being discussed. But how do you decide about what is same and what is different? That is the story of the whole history of Linguistics, as Bernard Bloch said. And even within the units themselves, when the teacher is told to discuss how texts differ in syntax, or to work out some rules from a few sample sentences, what is this but explicit linguistic analysis? I frankly doubt whether many teachers could do this well without training. Either they would simply impose old-fashioned analysis on the sentences, which would rather miss the point of the exercise; or they would miss some of the differences between sentence structure; or they would set up oversimplified rules which would have to be quickly altered as new sentences were brought in by the pupils. The alternative, to print a typical set of sentences (which can be guaranteed to be analysed safely and regularly) would develop into the unthinking orthodoxy and inflexibility which it is the aim of the course to avoid. The only solution, it seems to me, is to learn enough linguistics to be able to anticipate and thus control these problems - but the time and practice it takes to develop the spontaneous awareness of linguistic identity, similarity and types of divergence is considerable. Language in Use is wrong to minimise this problem. Language in Use in effect takes teachers so far and then says 'Carry on': but one cannot, without specialist training, and the amount of this must not be underestimated.

Let us look at this from a different angle. Language in Use provides many excellent ways of starting off a discussion, but it leaves the control of the ongoing discussion very much in the hands of the teacher - and this can lead to problems, without assistance. The teacher must know when to STOP the discussion, having begun it - when to let it continue would involve the pupils in too complex issues; and this means he must be able to see thorny issues in advance, to see the possibilities in a line of argument, and so on. Three examples will illustrate this - one from phonetics, one from semantics, and one from syntax. In phonetics, if accents are being discussed, and the difference between north and south emerges over the use of /a/, as in BATH, the point will quickly be made that north uses short /a/ whereas south uses long /a/. But this is only partly true, as words like /hat/ indicate. The apparent exceptions can throw a teacher who does not expect them. Here, then, we have a tendency rather than a rule; and the problem for Language in Use is to ... it manipulate rules or rules, tendencies or tendencies. This is a general issue. Many of the questions Language in Use raises do not have clear-cut answers, and the

teacher must be prepared for this. This point is not sufficiently emphasised. For instance, in dealing with contrasts in intonation, voice-quality, etc, it is important to know that the pupils will not always produce correct interpretations. In discussing 'distinctive voices', for example, as is done at one point, it is implied that the responses that will be obtained will be largely in agreement; but a teacher will be very lucky if this is so. Likewise, reactions to accent-interpretations will be extremely various, and some will be bound to be wrong. But will the teacher recognise differences in accents when he hears them, without some earlier training? Again, there are many useful practical 'tests' that would provide invaluable material for a teacher - tests about language change or variations in acceptability. Statistical information could be obtained in project work, or the teacher could get it from various summaries of usage around. Either way, the study of English inevitably involves the imparting of some body of knowledge. I call this doing linguistics.

Similar examples could be drawn from other areas of linguistics. In the analysis of meaning (in the unit on 'Black and White'), the exercise is to list a set of objects and identifying features in the form of a grid, and then go through them indicating whether they are plus the feature or minus the feature. This is a good exercise, but the teacher might also need to know that there are many words in the language which do not work in this binary way. For instance, if the opposition liquid/solid is being used, then what is TAR, BORNEO, etc? And in syntax, the need to label word-classes is not simply clerical; the questions such as 'Is DOWN a noun?' or 'Is ASLEEP an adverb?' can only be answered if the teacher is given some awareness of how parts of speech come to be established in the first place - the question of structural criteria again. This inevitably involves some straight linguistic knowledge; but once obtained, the flexibility it gives the teacher is enormous. Once we know how terms come to be used, then we can tolerate differences between users, we can develop our own concepts, confident that we are not being self-contradictory, and so on. The methodological contribution, once again.

In short, while Language in Use requires its pupils to make a largely ostensive analysis of language, accumulating inventories of features in texts they have collected for themselves, the teacher's job goes far beyond this, as he must be able to help them to generalise, to go beyond their texts, to get them thinking abstractly about what they are doing and what they can do. If the main aim of the exercise is to develop their command, or competence, then it must be made clear that this will never happen as long as the pupils are restricted to exercises of the inventory type. Pointing out causes of particular functional effects is not developing competence; competence implies creativity, and to get this an awareness of the formal power of language is prerequisite. Instead of questions of the type 'What features were used in the text to obtain such-and-such an effect?', we need 'What OTHER features could have been used?' Getting pupils to answer this last question is far more difficult, and requires fresh assumptions and techniques, which only linguistics can provide.

I have argued that the development of mother-tongue competence, as a pedagogical strategy, can only succeed if language-awareness is underpinned on the part of the teacher by linguistics-awareness. As already mentioned, this reasoning is applicable to far more than Language in Use. The approach of Britton, Barnes, and others also requires this underpinning. Their approach takes a general linguistic-educational-social hypothesis, and accumulates large samples of data as illustrative of the nature of the problem and of the ways available for attacking it. The authors' advice is always [illegible]. [illegible] book (L Stratta, J Dixon and A Wilkinson, PATTERNS OF LANGUAGE, 1973: 140), the teacher is advised, rightly, not just to be aware and empirical, but to study language more systematically. But they then say, '... the relationship of language with learning should be an essential study. What this study might consist of is,

of course, a matter for debate, but we suggest that perhaps a desirable course is not [illegible] psycho-linguistics, or socio-linguistics, though these are important, but what we shall call educational linguistics'. Their outline which follows tells us only about the breadth of this study, however; there is nothing specific, and the teacher will surely be left wondering how the required systematicity is to be obtained [illegible] which can offer it to him. Linguistics, is ruled out of court. The authors refer the reader to other books - Barnes et al, Britton, and Wilkinson - but even the latter, who is the most explicit about techniques, is a long way away from the kind of linguistic perspective discussed above.

I am wholly in favour of a functionalist perspective for linguistic studies, and I find [illegible] analysis and no reference to function, the pendulum has swung to the present approach - but the danger is to go to extremes, as a functionalist account of language with no formal controls can be just as sterile as the reverse. This, then, is where attention needs to be focussed in the near future. Without some grounding in linguistic principles and procedures, the aims of the whole educational exercise in language work are unlikely to be achieved. The gap has got to be bridged, and it can only be, in my opinion, after a whole battery of syllabus studies have taken place. What kind of linguistic constructs actually get used by teachers operating at, say, 4th form level. Could one work out the specific demands first, and then, as it were, write a grammar to fit? It remains to be seen. As it stands, at the moment, even if a teacher does become language-aware, he is left in great doubt as to how he can assess his pupils, or compare them with others. Two teachers may differ radically about the newfound linguistic abilities of a child. In other words, attention now needs to be paid to evaluative procedures - to testing, criteria, etc. This cannot be avoided. To take a final example, in the Project on Writing Across the Curriculum, there are many examples of children showing improvement after the recommended approach has been used. The interesting theoretical questions are why some children did not improve, or did not improve so much, or why teachers rate a particular kind of development more highly than others, or whether certain teachers get better results than others for a particular reason. Such questions cannot be answered as yet - indeed they are only beginning to be asked. Whatever the answers, it is quite clear that formal knowledge and systematic analytic techniques will play a large part in their formulation. I am not the person to make suggestions as to how further grounding in linguistic principles and procedures might be introduced into a training-programme. I hope this will be something that this conference will put its mind to. All I hope to have done in the present paper is to indicate that for the mother-tongue teacher, the question that should be being asked is not 'How little linguistics can we get away with?' but 'How much linguistics do we need?'